

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

In the non-final Office action dated December 28, 2009, claims 1-33 and 35-37 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 35, and 37 are independent. Claim 34 was previously canceled. The Office allows claims 6, 16, 17, 20-24, 26, and 36 if rewritten in independent form. Claims 35-37 are allowed.

35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 7-9, 11-15, 18, 19, 25, and 27-33 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,245,947 to Solakannel et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Solakannel"). The Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the following reasons, Solakannel does not anticipate claims 1-4, 7-9, 11-15, 18, 19, 25, and 27-33.

The Applicants' claim 1 is an independent claim that serves as a base claim for dependent claims 2-4, 7-9, 11-15, 18, 19, 25, and 27-33. Claim 1 requires:

A method of decentralized medium access control in a communications network including a plurality of devices, comprising:

dividing time into a sequence of at least one superframe; and

a first device of said plurality of devices transmitting in the superframe at a target beacon transmission time (TBTT) a beacon frame that includes a reservation for a planned transmission by a sender device during the superframe. [Emphasis added].

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Office Action alleges that Solakannel at figs. 1 and 5, column 7, line 62 to column 8, line 2 discloses "a beacon frame that includes a reservation for a planned transmission." The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Solakannel at fig. 1 illustrates a configuration of piconets at a given time (column 4, lines 43-44). Solakannel at fig. 5 illustrates an IEEE 802.15.3 TDMA frame format (column 7, lines 58-59). Solakannel at column 7, line 62 - column 8, line 2 explains that each superframe in figure 5 includes a beacon, a contention

access period, and a contention free period. The beacon is used to convey control information from the coordinator to the entire piconet. Examples of such control information involve, for example, synchronization, transmit power level constraints, and the allocation of time slots to devices in the piconet. The Office Action appears to point out Solakannel's mention of allocation of time slots to devices.

However, allocating time slots to devices is not the same as Applicants' claimed reservation for a planned transmission by a sender device during the superframe. There is nothing in Solakannel that suggests the allocated time slots are a reservation for a planned transmission by a sender device. Nor is there any suggestion that the allocation itself is based on reserving time slots for planned transmissions by a sender device.

In contrast to the claimed invention, which requires the beacon frame to include a reservation for a planned transmission, Solakannel only appears to mention allocating time slots.

Furthermore, Solakannel at column 8, lines 9-12 apparently provides:

The contention free period includes management time slots (MTS) and guaranteed time slots (GTS), which are used for isochronous streams and asynchronous data connections.

The guaranteed time slots of Solakannel are likewise different from the claimed invention, because the guaranteed time slots of Solakannel are not included in the beacon frame. Therefore, Solakannel is different from claim 1, and the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2-4, 7-9, 11-15, 18, 19, 25, and 27-33 ultimately depend from and incorporate all the features of allowable claim 1. Furthermore, each dependent claim includes additional distinguishing features. For each dependent claim, the Applicants essentially repeat the above arguments from claim 1 and apply them to each respective dependent claim. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-4, 7-9, 11-15, 18, 19, 25, and 27-33 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable parent claim and respectfully request

the withdrawal of the rejection to claims 2-4, 7-9, 11-15, 18, 19, 25, and 27-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 35 § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Solakannel in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,311 to Kondylis et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Kondylis").

Dependent claims 5 and 10 depend ultimately upon allowable claim 1 and incorporate by reference all of the respective features of claim 1, in addition to further distinguishing patentable features. The Office Action cites Kondylis as allegedly teaching or disclosing features in claims 5 and 10 which are admitted as lacking by Solakannel. The Applicants essentially repeat the above arguments from claim 1 and apply them to claims 5 and 10. As such, Kondylis, separately or in combination with Solakannel, does not cure the deficiencies as noted as applied to claim 1. Hence, the withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 5 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Office allows claims 6, 16, 17, 20-24, 26, and 36 if rewritten in independent form. Claims 35-37 are allowable.

Conclusion

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's correspondence and advance the prosecution of this case. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance.

If there are any errors with respect to the fees for this response or any other

papers related to this response, the Director is hereby given permission to charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Brian S. Myers/
Brian S. Myers
Registration No.: 46,947
973-401-7157